

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited in the United States Postal Service as first class mail in the envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on

1/3/03
(Date of Deposit)
John I. Ka
Attorney
44815
Reg. No.

Reg for Record

#6

1/15/03

PATENT B Ross

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application of:

Applicant : Yukari Hashizume
Serial No. : 10/037,728
Filed : October 19, 2001
Title : BINDER INSERT
Docket : 550718-093
Examiner : Mark T. Henderson
Art Unit : 3722

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

RECEIVED
JAN 09 2003
TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

Sir:

RESPONSE

This paper is submitted in response to the Office action mailed on October 3, 2002, having a period of response extending through and including January 3, 2003. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16 stand rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,301,445 to Hoffmeister in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,568,178 to Widder. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

The Office action recites Hoffmeister as teaching a binder insert comprising a transparent plastic bag-shaped body with an open upper side, a photograph store portion and a memo store portion, a store board and a binding section having a plurality of binding holes. As indicated in

the Office action, Hoffmeister fails to disclose a store board having slits at predetermined locations and slits and in various shapes. The Office action relies on Widder for teaching these missing elements indicates that it would have been obvious to combine the store board having slits as taught by Widder with the binder insert disclosed by Hoffmeister.

Initially, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 has been misconstrued with respect to the portion of the claim reciting “a color paper therebetween”. This language refers to color paper being positioned between the two sides of the thick paper folded in two and forming the store board. The presence of the colored paper between the two sides of the thick paper forming the store board is a structural feature of the invention as set forth in claim 1 that is neither disclosed nor described in the prior art references cited. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to claim 1 because the prior art references cited by the examiner considered either individually or in combination fail to disclose each and every element of the claimed structure.

Furthermore, not only do the prior art references fail to disclose the colored paper situated between the folded portions of the thick paper forming the store board, the references also fail to disclose a transparent plastic body having a photograph store portion and a memo store portion and a memo paper to be inserted into the memo store portion. Hoffmeister discloses a memo or margin area adjacent the photograph storage pockets. However, as clearly shown in Figs. 5 and 6, the memo or margin area is an extension of the backing sheet 18 beyond the width of the transparent sheet 24. There is no disclosure of a memo store portion or a memo paper to be inserted therein. Accordingly, the reference fails to disclose or suggest a memo store portion and a memo paper to be inserted into the memo store portion as presently set forth in claim 1. Accordingly, for this reason as well, applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to disclose this element of the claimed structure and therefore are insufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Applicants also maintain that the cited references fail to provide the requisite motivation to combine and modify the cited prior art references.

A determination of obviousness based on a combination of elements disclosed in the prior art must include some reference to a motivation, suggestion or teaching to combine the references. See, e.g., *In re Dance*, 160 F.3d 1339, 1343, 48 U.S.P.Q. 2d (BNA) 1635, 1637 (Fed. Cir. 1998). The motivation, suggestion or teaching may come from the prior art, the knowledge of one skilled in the art or from the nature of the problem to be solved. *In re Dembiczak*, 175 F.3d 994, 999, 50 U.S.P.Q. 2d (BNA) 1614, 1617 (Fed. Cir. 1999). A finding of obviousness without particular findings as to the motivation or suggestion in the prior art for combining the references is an impermissible use of hindsight based on the Applicants' application. *In re Paulsen*, 31 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1671, 1676 (Fed. Cir. 1994) ("Multiple cited prior art references must suggest the desirability of being combined, and the references must be viewed without the benefit of hindsight afforded by the disclosure.").

The Office action indicates that it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Hoffmeister with that of Widder to teach the invention as claimed. The proposed motivation for combining the references is to provide a method of "mounting the photographs in a stable position on the store board." Applicants respectfully submit that no such motivation to combine the references exists.

Specifically, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention would not have been motivated to combine Hoffmeister with Widder to teach the invention as claimed because the references fail to provide any motivation to make the proposed combination. Furthermore, applicants submit that the two references are not properly combinable. One of skill in the art reading the Hoffmeister reference would not be motivated to combine Hoffmeister with Widder's method for mounting photographs in a stable position since this is the exact problem that Hoffmeister addresses. Hoffmeister describes the images as being "retained in a fixed

Response

Page 4 of 5

position with respect to the backing sheet, and are retained against lateral sliding movement and vertical downward movement.” See Column 2, lines 46-50. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not need to look to other references for a method of mounting the photographs in a stable position on the store board. Furthermore, the mounting methods disclosed in Hoffmeister and Widder rely on significantly different mechanisms for mounting photographs in a stable position such that combining the two would be impractical. Widder discloses a mounting sheet having a plurality of slots designed to engage tabs 25 by photograph mounting pocket 20. The photograph to be mounted is inserted through slot 26 and may be protected by a sheet 23 of transparent material. The mounting pocket can be oriented vertically or horizontally by engaging tabs 25 in either slits 16 or 17. Accordingly, the slits 16 and 17 of the Widder photograph mount engage a photograph mounting pocket 20 as opposed to the photographs themselves. Combining the mounting system of Widder with the album page of Hoffmeister would involve significant modifications of the Hoffmeister structure which would eliminate many of the benefits of the Hoffmeister mounting page. The Hoffmeister design provides a relatively simple and efficient way of displaying images which are retained in a fixed position and centered on the sheet. Widder, on the other hand, requires insertion of the photograph in the storage pocket and engagement of four tabs to hold the mounting pocket in place. One of skill in the art would not consider the mounting device disclosed by Widder as being a viable alternative method for mounting photographs in a stable position in the Hoffmeister album page. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that the prior art cited fails to supply the requisite motivation to combine and modify the teachings in the prior art to arrive at the present invention.

With respect to claim 1, as noted above, the recitation of color paper between the thick paper folded in two is a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art rather than just a recitation of intended use. Furthermore, this structure is not disclosed in the references cited.

U.S. Serial No. 10/037,728
Attorney Docket No. 550718-093


Response

Page 5 of 5

With respect to claims 6 and 12 which recite color print portions having different colors corresponding to standardized photograph sizes, the Office action indicates that “the choice of ornamentation producing no mechanical effect or advantage considered to constitute the invention are considered obvious and do not impart patentability.” Applicants note that the color paper having color print portions is advantageous in that it provides an indication as to the proper slits to use for various size photographs. Furthermore, the presence of the color paper in the store board is advantageous in that it prevents contact between the corners or photographs inserted from each side of the store board.

In light of the foregoing response, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-16, now pending, are patentably distinct from the references cited and are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of record is respectfully requested. If the examiner wishes to discuss any aspect of this response, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,


John F. Kane, Reg. No. 44,815

THOMPSON HINE LLP
2000 Courthouse Plaza, N.E.
10 West Second Street
Dayton, Ohio 45402-1758
937-443-6816

3722

Please type a plus sign (+) inside this box → ☐

PTO/SB/21 (08-00)

Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM <i>(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)</i>	Application Number	10/037,728	
	Filing Date	October 19, 2001	
	First Named Inventor	Yukari Hashizume	
	Group Art Unit	3722	
	Examiner Name	Mark T. Henderson	
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	6	Attorney Docket Number	550718-093

ENCLOSURES <i>(check all that apply)</i>				
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amendment / Reply <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Assignment Papers <i>(for an Application)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to Group <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Group <i>(Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) <i>(please identify below):</i> <div style="text-align: center;">Return Post Card</div>		
<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 15%;">Remarks</td> <td>The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees required (including the fee for any extension of time), or to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Acct No.: 20-0809.</td> </tr> </table>			Remarks	The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees required (including the fee for any extension of time), or to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Acct No.: 20-0809.
Remarks	The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees required (including the fee for any extension of time), or to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Acct No.: 20-0809.			

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT	
Firm or Individual name	Thompson Hine LLP 2000 Courthouse Plaza NE, 10 West Second Street Dayton, Ohio 45402-1758
Signature	<i>John F. Kane</i>
Date	1/3/03

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING			
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231 on this date: 1/3/03			
Typed or printed name	John F. Kane, Esq.		
Signature	<i>John F. Kane</i>	Date	1/3/03

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 0.2 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.

RECEIVED

JAN 09 2003 TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700